

1 LAFAYETTE & KUMAGAI LLP
2 GARY T. LAFAYETTE (SBN 88666)
3 Email: glafayette@lkclaw.com
4 BRIAN H. CHUN (SBN 215417)
5 Email: bchun@lkclaw.com
6 1300 Clay Street, Suite 810
7 Oakland, California 94612
8 Telephone: (415) 357-4600
9 Facsimile: (415) 357-4605

10 Attorneys for Defendant
11 SAFEWAY INC.

12 SIEGEL, YEE, BRUNNER & MEHTA
13 DAN SIEGEL (SBN 56400)
14 Email: dansiegel@siegelyee.com
15 ANDREW CHAN KIM (SBN 315331)
16 Email: chankim@siegelyee.com
17 475 14th Street, Suite 500
18 Oakland, California 94612
19 Telephone: (510) 839-1200
20 Facsimile: (510) 444-6698

21 Attorneys for Plaintiff
22 DEBRA HORN

23
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
25 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

26 DEBRA HORN,
27 Plaintiff,
28 vs.
SAFEWAY INC. and Does 1-50,
Defendants.

Case No. 3:19-cv-02488-JCS

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT
STATEMENT**

Date: October 16/July 17, 2020
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Courtroom: F – 15th Floor
Judge: Hon. Joseph C. Spero

Action Filed: March 11, 2019
Notice of Removal Filed: May 8, 2019
Trial Date: September 27, 2021

1 Plaintiff Debra Horn (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant Safeway Inc. (“Defendant”) submit this
 2 Joint Case Management Statement pursuant to Local Rule 16-9(a).

3 **1. Jurisdiction and Service**

4 This case has been removed from California state court based upon federal question
 5 jurisdiction. No known issues exist regarding personal jurisdiction or venue. No parties remain
 6 to be served.

7 **2. Facts**

8 **A. Plaintiff’s Summary of Facts**

9 Defendant Safeway hired Ms. Horn as a clerk in 2003. She stocked product shelves,
 10 cashiered, assisted with self-checkout, and performed general customer service. Ms. Horn
 11 suffered on the job foot injuries in 2005, requiring several surgeries and caused her increasing
 12 pain which occurred within an hour of standing at Safeway’s check-out stand. This condition
 13 continued thereafter. Beginning in 2006, Ms. Horn’s doctors recommended that Safeway either
 14 provide her with a stool at her work station or limit her work to activities that do not require her
 15 to stand for long periods. Despite these recommendations, Safeway frequently assigned Ms.
 16 Horn to check-out for more than four hours in a shift.

17 From 2006 to 2017, Safeway repeatedly refused to provide a stool at Ms. Horn’s work
 18 station, refused to honor her doctors’ recommendations, and failed to discuss possible ways to
 19 accommodate her disability. In 2016, Ms. Horn complained to Safeway that it was
 20 discriminating against her on the basis of her disability, that it was failing to reasonably
 21 accommodate her disability, and that managers and coworkers were harassing her regarding her
 22 disability. Safeway issued a written warning, then a three-day suspension to Ms. Horn the
 23 following month, accusing her of poor customer service. Ms. Horn reasonably believes this was
 24 in retaliation for her assertion of her rights as a disabled employee. In March of 2017, Safeway
 25 refused to approve Ms. Horn’s vacation request and denied her funeral leave request. Ms. Horn
 26 reasonably believes this was in retaliation for her assertion of her rights as a disabled employee.

27 On March 25, 2017, Ms. Horn’s coworker, Cindy Cornejo, told her to call the police on a
 28 suspected shoplifter. Ms. Horn refused. Cornejo dialed 911 on her own phone, handed it to Ms.

LAFAYETTE & KUMAGAI LLP
 ATTORNEYS AT LAW
 1300 CLAY STREET, SUITE 810
 OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
 (415) 357-4600
 FAX (415) 357-4605

1 Horn, and began following the customer Cornejo suspected of shoplifting. The customer later
 2 came to Ms. Horn's self check-out station and asked for the manager. Ms. Horn called the
 3 Person In Charge, Zaine Caddell.

4 Safeway suspended Ms. Horn indefinitely on April 26, 2017, without explanation, then
 5 promptly refused her request for medical coverage while on leave. Ms. Horn reasonably believes
 6 this was in retaliation for her assertion of her rights as a disabled employee.

7 Safeway terminated Ms. Horn's employment on June 29, 2017, accusing her of violation
 8 of company policy or procedures, only later explaining that the alleged violation of policy was
 9 regarding a policy for handling suspected shoplifters. Ms. Horn denies she violated any such
 10 policy or procedure and denies any warning regarding failure to comply.

11 On February 10, 2019, Safeway reduced Ms. Horn's termination to a one-year unpaid
 12 suspension after binding arbitration pursuant to her collective bargaining agreement. Safeway
 13 then reinstated her as an employee.

14 **B. Defendant's Summary of Facts**

15 Plaintiff is a current employee of Defendant and was employed as a food clerk during the
 16 time period relevant to this case. On June 28, 2017, Defendant terminated Plaintiff's
 17 employment after she disregarded specific instructions on the handling of suspected shoplifters
 18 and violated company policies. She had been warned beforehand that her failure to comply with
 19 these instructions would result in discipline up to and including termination. Plaintiff's union
 20 filed a grievance on her behalf and following an arbitration, the arbitrator concluded that Plaintiff
 21 had "engaged in serious misconduct by indulging in racial profiling and falsely accusing
 22 customers of theft without having a reasonable basis for doing so," "exposed the company to
 23 liability," and "left her assigned work for a period of time" in violation of company policies.
 24 While the arbitrator concluded that "serious discipline" was "warranted for the misconduct" and
 25 that Plaintiff had demonstrated a "lack of candor," he reduced the termination to a one year
 26 suspension.

27 With regard to Plaintiff's claims in this case, Defendant denies that it retaliated against
 28 Plaintiff for engaging in protected activity, discriminated against or harassed Plaintiff based on

LAFAYETTE & KUMAGAI LLP
 ATTORNEYS AT LAW
 1300 CLAY STREET, SUITE 810
 OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
 (415) 357-4600
 FAX (415) 357-4605

1 her alleged disability or perceived disability, failed to take reasonable steps to prevent
 2 discrimination against Plaintiff, failed to provide reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff's
 3 alleged disability or perceived disability and/or failed to properly engage in the interactive
 4 process to determine reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff's alleged disability or perceived
 5 disability.

6 **3. Legal Issues**

7 1. Whether Defendant retaliated against Plaintiff in violation of California Labor
 8 Code § 1102.5 because Plaintiff disclosed information, or because Defendant believed that
 9 Plaintiff may disclose information, to a government or law enforcement agency, to a person with
 10 authority over Plaintiff or to another employee who has the authority to investigate, discover, or
 11 correct the violation or noncompliance, and whether Plaintiff had reasonable cause to believe that
 12 the information disclosed a violation of state or federal statute, or a violation of or noncompliance
 13 with a local, state, or federal rule or regulation.

14 2. Whether Defendant retaliated against Plaintiff in violation of the California Fair
 15 Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA").

16 3. Whether Defendant harassed Plaintiff based on her alleged disability or perceived
 17 disability in violation of the FEHA.

18 4. Whether Defendant aided, abetted, incited, compelled or coerced others to harass
 19 Plaintiff based on her alleged disability or perceived disability in violation of the FEHA.

20 5. Whether Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff based on her alleged disability
 21 or perceived disability in violation of the FEHA.

22 6. Whether Defendant failed to take reasonable steps to prevent discrimination
 23 against Plaintiff based on her alleged disability or perceived disability in violation of the FEHA.

24 7. Whether Defendant failed to provide reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff's
 25 alleged disability or perceived disability in violation of the FEHA.

26 8. Whether Defendant failed to properly engage in the interactive process to
 27 determine reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff's alleged disability or perceived disability in
 28 violation of the FEHA.

LAFAYETTE & KUMAGAI LLP
 ATTORNEYS AT LAW
 1300 CLAY STREET, SUITE 810
 OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
 (415) 357-4600
 FAX (415) 357-4605

1 9. Whether Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff based on her alleged disability
 2 or perceived disability in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”).

3 10. Whether Defendant failed to provide reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff’s
 4 alleged disability in violation of the ADA.

5 11. Whether Defendant harassed Plaintiff based on her alleged disability or perceived
 6 disability in violation of the ADA.

7 12. Whether Defendant retaliated against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA.

8 13. Whether Plaintiff failed to mitigate her alleged damages.

9 **4. Motions**

10 **A. Plaintiff’s Motions**

11 Plaintiff has not filed any motions to date. Plaintiff does not currently anticipate filing
 12 motions.

13 **B. Defendant’s Motions**

14 Defendant has not filed any motions to date. Defendant anticipates filing a motion for
 15 summary judgment or, in the alternative, partial summary judgment, or other dispositive motions.

16 **5. Amendment of Pleadings**

17 **A. Plaintiff**

18 No amendments are currently expected.

19 **B. Defendant**

20 No amendments are expected.

21 **6. Evidence Preservation**

22 The parties have reviewed the Guidelines Relating to the Discovery of Electronically
 23 Stored Information and have met and conferred regarding reasonable and proportionate steps
 24 taken to preserve evidence relevant to the issues reasonably evident in this action.

25 **7. Disclosures**

26 The parties have produced documents and information pursuant to the Court’s Initial
 27 Discovery Protocols.

1 **8. Discovery**

2 The parties have propounded and responded to initial written discovery requests.
 3 Defendant commenced taking the deposition of Plaintiff on August 21, 2020 via Zoom video.
 4 This deposition was placed on hold due to Plaintiff's poor internet connection. The parties
 5 resumed Plaintiff's deposition on August 27, 2020, wherein a dispute arose regarding whether
 6 Defendant had exceeded the 7-hour limit. The parties are working to resolve the issue. Plaintiff
 7 will take the depositions of several witnesses. The parties are currently engaged in settlement
 8 discussions, and if they are unable to reach a settlement, the parties will propound additional
 9 written discovery requests as necessary in an effort to follow up on outstanding issues, and notice
 10 additional depositions.

11 On March 13, 2020, the Court granted in part and denied in part Plaintiff's motion to
 12 compel. ECF No. 30. Defendant has complied in part and the parties are discussing the timeline
 13 for Defendant's full compliance with the Court's order, which has been delayed due to the
 14 COVID-19 pandemic.

15 **9. Class Actions**

16 This case is not a class action.

17 **10. Related Cases**

18 The parties are not aware of any related cases.

19 **11. Relief**

20 **A. Plaintiff**

21 Plaintiff seeks special damages for health care expenses; general damages for pain and
 22 suffering; general damages for emotional distress, embarrassment and humiliation, and damage
 23 to reputation and standing; and punitive damages.

24 Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief to require Safeway to cease and desist from engaging in or
 25 allowing unlawful workplace harassment on the basis of disability or perceived disability; to
 26 require Safeway to provide mandatory training to all supervisors it employs in the identification
 27 and prevention of workplace harassment based on disability, failure to reasonably accommodate
 28 disability in the workplace, and failure to engage in the interactive process in determining

LAFAYETTE & KUMAGAI LLP
 ATTORNEYS AT LAW
 1300 CLAY STREET, SUITE 810
 OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
 (415) 357-4600
 FAX (415) 357-4605

1 reasonable accommodation of disability or perceived disability in the workplace; and to require
 2 Safeway to publish a policy statement delineating employee rights and manager responsibilities
 3 with regard to employee complaints of harassment or discrimination on the basis of disability and
 4 to post that policy statement prominently in the workplace.

5 **B. Defendant**

6 Defendant is not yet in a position to make an assessment regarding Plaintiff's alleged
 7 damages. However, the parties agree that she is not entitled to any damages for lost wages.

8 **12. Settlement and ADR**

9 The parties participated in a court-sponsored mediation with court-appointed mediator
 10 Kari Levine, Esq. on September 16, 2020. The parties did not reach a settlement but are
 11 currently engaging in continuing settlement discussions.

12 The parties have complied with ADR L.R. 3-5.

13 **13. Consent to Magistrate Judge For All Purposes**

14 The parties have consented to have a magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings.

15 **14. Other References**

16 The case is not suitable for reference to binding arbitration, a special master, or the
 17 Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.

18 **15. Narrowing of Issues**

19 The parties do not agree, at this time, to the narrowing of issues. At this time, the parties
 20 do not have suggestions to expedite the presentation of evidence at trial.

21 **16. Expedited Schedule**

22 The parties do not agree to the Expedited Trial Procedure.

23 **17. Scheduling**

24 The current schedule is set forth below:

- 25 (a) Non-expert discovery cutoff: February 12, 2021
- 26 (b) Last day to file dispositive motions: February 26, 2021
- 27 (c) Last day to file opposition to dispositive motions: March 19, 2021
- 28 (d) Last day to file reply to dispositive motions: April 2, 2021

LAFAYETTE & KUMAGAI LLP
 ATTORNEYS AT LAW
 1300 CLAY STREET, SUITE 810
 OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
 (415) 357-4600
 FAX (415) 357-4605

- 1 (e) Hearing on dispositive motions: April 30, 2021 at 9:30 a.m.
 2 (f) Expert witness disclosures: May 31, 2021
 3 (g) Rebuttal expert disclosures: July 5, 2021
 4 (h) Expert discovery cutoff: August 9, 2021
 5 (i) Final pretrial conference: September 10, 2021 at 2:00 p.m.
 6 (j) Trial: September 27, 2021 at 8:30 a.m.

7 **18. Trial**

8 Plaintiff has demanded trial by jury. Plaintiff believes the jury trial will last
 9 approximately 5 days. Defendant believes the jury trial will last approximately 10 court days.

10 **19. Disclosure of Non-Party Interested Entities or Persons**

11 **A. Plaintiff**

12 Plaintiff has filed the “Certification of Interested Entities or Persons” required by Civil
 13 Local Rule 3-15. Plaintiff certifies that no such interest is known to her other than that of the
 14 named parties to the action.

15 **B. Defendant**

16 Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-15, Defendant certifies that the following listed persons,
 17 associations of persons, firms, partnerships, corporations (including parent corporations) or other
 18 entities (i) have a financial interest in the subject matter in controversy or in a party to the
 19 proceeding, or (ii) have a non-financial interest in that subject matter or in a party that could be
 20 substantially affected by the outcome of this proceeding: Albertsons Holdings LLC and AB
 21 Acquisition LLC.

22 **20. Professional Conduct**

23 The parties have reviewed the Guidelines for Professional Conduct for the Northern
 24 District of California.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

LAFAYETTE & KUMAGAI LLP
 ATTORNEYS AT LAW
 1300 CLAY STREET, SUITE 810
 OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
 (415) 357-4600
 FAX (415) 357-4605

1 **21. Other Matters**

2 None at this time.

3 DATED: October 9, 2020

4 LAFAYETTE & KUMAGAI LLP

5 */s/ Brian H. Chun*
6 BRIAN H. CHUN
7 Attorneys for Defendant
8 SAFEWAY INC.

9 DATED: October 9, 2020

10 SIEGEL, YEE, BRUNNER & MEHTA

11 */s/ Andrew Chan Kim*
12 ANDREW CHAN KIM
13 Attorneys for Plaintiff
14 DEBRA HORN

15 **SIGNATURE ATTESTATION**

16 I hereby attest that I have obtained the concurrence of Andrew Chan Kim, counsel for
17 Plaintiff, for the filing of this Joint Case Management Statement.

18 */s/ Brian H. Chun*
19 BRIAN H. CHUN

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28